

REMARKS

The present application contains claims 1-70, all of which are currently under consideration, and the status of which is as follows:

(a) Claims 2-6, 8-21, 24-28, 30-35, 38-42, and 44-57 are as originally filed.

(b) Claims 1, 23, and 37 have been currently amended.

(c) Claims 59-70 are new.

(d) Claims 7, 22, 29, 36, 43, and 58 have been canceled without prejudice.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 11-21, 23-25, 32-35, 37-39, and 47-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,789,107 to Bates et al. Claims 4-7, 26-29, and 40-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of US Patent 6,832,244 to Raghunandan. Claims 8-10, 30-31, and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Raghunandan, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2002/0087679 to Pulley et al.

(Although the Examiner indicated in paragraph 2 (p. 2) of the office action that all of claims 1-3 and 11-58 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bates, this was clearly a typographical error regarding claims 22, 26-31, 36, 40-46, and 58. As indicated by the Examiner in paragraphs 19-22 (p.7), these claims were rejected for the same reasons set forth for claims 4-10 and 22, respectively, and not under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).)

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 4-10, 26-31, and 40-46. The present application and the applications that issued as both the Bates and Raghunandan patents were commonly owned by the same person (International Business Machines Corporation) at the time the invention of the present application was made. Both the Bates and Raghunandan patents issued after the January 4, 2002 filing date of the present application, and thus are available as potential prior art against the present application only under 35 U.S. 102(e). Therefore, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103(c), the Bates and Raghunandan patents are not available under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as potential prior art against the present application. Consequently, claims 4-10, 26-31, and 40-46 are allowable.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 23, and 37 to include the limitation of dependent claims 7, 29, and 43, respectively. Given the allowablility of these dependent claims pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103(c), the Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 1, 23, and 37 are now in a condition for allowance. Claims 2-6, 8-21, 24-28, 30-35, 38-42, and 44-57 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 23, and 37, respectively. Given the patentability of these independent claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are also allowable. The Applicant has canceled dependent claims 7, 29, and 43, because the limitation of these claims has been incorporated into claims 1, 23, and 37, respectively, as mentioned above.

Claims 22, 36, and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Raghunandan. Although the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's grounds for rejecting these claims, the Applicant has canceled these claims without prejudice in order to expedite the issuance of a patent on the claims believed to be allowable. The Applicant may prosecute these claims in a continuation application. (The Applicant notes that the Examiner's grounds for rejection of these claims apparently do not take into consideration the amendment of these claims received by the Office on May 23, 2005.)

Claims 59-70 are new. Each of these claims depends, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 23, or 37. Given the patentability of these independent claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that these new dependent claims are also

allowable. These new claims are supported in the specification as originally filed by at least the following:  
"In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, the user's computer provides a graphical display of the organizational hierarchy (e.g., a tree), and superimposes on the hierarchy a series of markers indicative of the propagation history of the e-mail" (paragraph [0008] of the publication of the present application).

The Applicant believes the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are now in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By

  
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BAV\C\colb\RIBAK2\PTO\Amd 28Sept05.doc